

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated September 20, 2006, in which claims 1-20 were rejected, and in response to the interview conducted with the Examiner on November 13, 2006. With this Amendment, claims 1 and 18 have been amended and the remaining claims are unchanged in the Application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims 1-20.

In section 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-16 and 18-20 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,320,559 in view of Schoolman, U.S. Patent No. 5,281,957. In section 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 13, 18 and 19 were rejected under §102(a) as being anticipated by Yasukawa. In section 5 of the Office Action, claim 7 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa in view of Schoolman and further in view of Preston, U.S. Patent No. 6,094,283. In section 6 of the Office Action, Claim 14 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa et al. and Schoolman and further in view of Hori et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,072,209, hereinafter Hori. In section 7 of the Office Action, claim 17 was also under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa in view of Schoolman and further in view of Kato et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,497,170. In section 8 of the Office Action, claims 3 and 11 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa in view of Schoolman and further in view of Mann, U.S. Patent No. 6,307,526.

With this Amendment, claims 1 and 20 are amended to clarify that the projection unit is structurally and functionally application-independent. Support for this Amendment is present in the Specification because it indicates that the projection unit replaces the biggest component of a computer, which is a monitor/display unit. In other words, the projection unit of the present invention is simply a replacement for the monitor and, like the monitor, does not depend on any specific application that is running on the computer.

As discussed in the interview with the Examiner on November 13, 2006, in contrast with the application-independent nature of the claimed invention, Yasukawa's invention is centered around "Computer Aided Engineering (CAE) and Design." Specific aspects of

Yasukawa's invention that illustrate its application-dependent nature, are as follows:

- As indicated, for instance, in the summary section (column 3, line 49), of Yasukawa, there is a distinctive first, and second display area, both comprising of, and specific to, CAE drawings. The first area shows that a CAE drawing document is brought to the forefront, by a footswitch (4 of Fig. 1), from the second display area, which contains other CAE drawing documents. Modern day applications are non-linear, and a user may randomly choose to switch between different heterogeneous applications, with the help of a mouse/keyboard, which are independent of such applications. Yasukawa uses a footswitch, which cycles through homogenous CAE drawing documents in a specific order. A keyboard, or a mouse, differ in that they are not functionally or structurally tied to enable the manipulation of CAE drawing documents for a specific application.
- Figs. 6 and 7 indicate that Yasukawa is waiting for a triggered input signal, to switch from one CAE drawing document (in the secondary display area) to another (to bring it to the first display area).

In summary, since Yasukawa's projection is structurally and functionally tied to a specific application, Yasukawa does not teach or suggest that "the projection unit is structurally and functionally application-independent," as required by independent claims 1 and 18. The remaining cited references (Schoolman, Preston, Hori, Kato and Mann) do not overcome the deficiencies of Yasukawa. Therefore, claims 1 and 18 are non-obvious and allowable over the cited art.

Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependency, either directly or indirectly, from the allowable independent claims. Further, the dependent claims set forth numerous elements not shown or suggested in the cited references.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims 1-20. Favorable action upon all claims is solicited.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: Alan G. Rego
Alan G. Rego, Reg. No. 45,956
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

AGR/tkj